



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/158,938 09/22/98 KARMI

G 365462002000

023696  
Qualcomm Incorporated  
Patents Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego CA 92121-1714

WM02/0314

EXAMINER

PEREZ GUTIERREZ, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2683

DATE MAILED:

03/14/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Advisory Action

Application No.

09/158,938

Applicant(s)

Karml et al.

Examiner

Rafael Perez-Gutierrez

Group Art Unit

2683



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Feb 26, 2001 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):
- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☒ will not be entered because:
- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☒ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The added limitation in claim 1 of "the respective signature being separated from the respective message" raises a new issue that would require additional consideration and search. As to the new matter, see other below.

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: 44-47 and 59-61Claims rejected: 1-43, 48-58, and 62

- ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on Feb 26, 2001 ☒ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other The amendment to the specification changing "sequence number" to "signature" raises a new matter issue because the concept of signature is not clearly defined in the disclosure. On page 7 lines 1-22, as Applicant argues, the use of signatures in overhead messages is disclosed, however, definition of what a signature is, per se, has not been provided, therefore, the amendment is consider to be raising a new matter issue.

*Refect by signature*  
*W-TZ 3/9/01*  
**WILLIAM TROST**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**